

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SALOME MADRIGAL OSEGUERA,)	No. CV-F-05-581 REC
)	(No. CR-F-99-5039 REC)
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER DISMISSING MOTION TO
)	VACATE, SET ASIDE OR CORRECT
vs.)	SENTENCE AND DIRECTING ENTRY
)	OF JUDGMENT FOR RESPONDENT
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

On May 2, 2005, petitioner Salome Madrigal Oseguera filed a motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Petitioner contends that his defense counsel, stated to be Francine Zepeda at all stages, failed to file a notice of appeal after being requested to do so by petitioner.

On July 2, 2003, petitioner filed a Section 2255 motion asserting the identical claim against defense counsel Juan Falcon.¹ By Order filed on September 4, 2003, the court

¹In his prior Section 2255 motion, petitioner claimed that defense counsel Dana Anderson failed to file a notice of appeal

1 dismissed this petition as untimely. Judgment for respondent was
2 entered. Petitioner did not appeal the dismissal.

3 Because the court did not reach the merits of petitioner's
4 prior Section 2255 motion, the court does not dismiss the instant
5 motion as a second or successive motion. See United States v.
6 Mathews, 833 F.2d 161, 164 (9th Cir. 1987).

7 However, the court again concludes that the instant motion
8 is untimely for the reasons set forth in the Order filed on
9 September 4, 2003 and dismisses the instant motion on that
10 ground.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 **Dated: May 4, 2005**
13 668554

/s/ Robert E. Coyle
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 _____
24 after being requested to do so. However, as the court noted in
25 various orders, petitioner was represented by Juan Falcon at the
26 time of sentencing. Therefore, petitioner's assertion in the
instant motion that Francine Zepeda was ineffective because of the
failure to file a notice of appeal is factually incorrect.